

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 6-10 and 27-33 will be pending in the Application after the Examiner enters the forgoing amendment.

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 6-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being "as being indefinite" (unclear) stating, *inter alia*: "Claim 1 recites numerous first, second and third processors. No such support is found in the specification Further, there is no correlation with the above enumerated processors and the drawing figures." (Office Action page 2).

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 6-10, "as understood," under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by (identical to) U.S. Patent No. 6,497,360 Schulze, or U.S. Patent No. 5,815,657 to Williams. (Office Action page 3).

Applicant respectfully submits that the pending are not suggested by any reasonable combination of the art of record, and otherwise comply with the statutes and regulations.

The first processor recited in claim 1 is supported by, but not limited to, computer 42 described, for example, at Fig. 8 and page 7, lines 1-7:

Computer 42 can correlate products and coupons for multiple customers performing checkout transactions at respective multiple checkout stations. To perform this correlation, computer 42 includes circuitry for reading and writing data to customer cards and, more specifically, computer 42 has circuitry that controls which card locations to read and write.

For example, at the time depicted in Fig. 4, computer 42 correlates products selected by customer 280, the holder of card 285, with coupons on card 285 in checkout station 300. To perform this correlation . . .

The second processor recited in claim 1 is supported by, but not limited to, card interface system 20 described, for example, at Fig. 8 and page 14, lines 7-12:

In card interface system 20, CPU 352 send data to, and receives data from cable 10 via network interface 27. CPU 352 executes program 342 in random

access, addressable memory 333. CPU 352 and program 342 act to receive electronic coupons from a customer card, via reader/writer 315.

A physical layer includes an RS_232 asynchronous serial connection on which CPU 350 in system 30 communicates with CPU 352 in system 20 via RS232 line 28 . . .

The third processor recited in claim 1 is supported by, but not limited to, cash register system 30 described, for example, at Fig. 8 and page 13, lines 20-22:

Checkout station 300 includes cash register system 30 and card interface system 20. Cash register system 30 includes an IBM 4680-4690 Point of Sale System. . . .

The recitation of "sending the first signal from the second processor to the first processor" in claim 27 is supported by, but not limited to, page 17, lines 19-20, disclosing, "When system 20 receives an application layer command from system 30, system 20 sends the command to computer 42"; and page 18, lines 5-6, disclosing, "When computer 42 receives an Item Committed command identifying a product selected by a customer at station 300, computer 42 adds the product to a basket list in station 50."

The applied art appears to have little relevance to the pending claims.

Schulze discloses a system for "prompt coupon reimbursement after coupon redemption."

Williams discloses an electronic monetary system for transactions using an electronic-monetary system emulating a wallet or a purse. (Abstract). Williams discloses that smart cards are one of the "supported payment instruments." (col. 17, lines 48-57).

In contrast, each of claims 1-3, 6-10, and 27-33 recites an interrelation of steps, performed for each checkout station to perform a checkout transaction for a customer, of reading a first location from a customer card via the second processor; determining, in the first processor, a second location; and writing to the second location of the customer card

via the second processor. (Base claims 1 and 27). No reasonable combination of the art of record, including Schulze and Williams, suggests this recited interrelation including determining a location in the recited first processor and writing to the location via the recited second processor.

Although the Examiner stated that Schulze discloses "a computer system using a customer card . . .," Applicant notes that Schulze neither discloses nor suggests a customer card as recited in Applicant's claims.

Williams does not purport to deal with writing to a card. Thus, Williams cannot suggest the recited determining, in the first processor, a second location; and writing to the second location of the customer card via the second processor. (Base claims 1 and 27).

If there are any other fees required for entry of this amendment, or for any other reason, please charge such fees to the undersigned attorney's Deposit Account No. 10-0077.

If the Examiner has any questions about this amendment, applicant's representative would appreciate discussing this amendment with the Examiner. Applicant's representative, Jerome Jackson, can be reached at 703-684-4840.

Respectfully submitted,



Jerome D. Jackson
Reg. No. 33,186

DATED: 21 Feb 05

Jackson Patent Law Office
211 N. Union Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Telephone 703-684-4840
Facsimile 703-995-0318